

The Sun

AND NEW YORK PRESS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1918.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively
entitled to the use for publication of all
news dispatches credited to it, or not
otherwise credited, and the Sun and also
the local news published herein.
All rights of republication of special
dispatches herein are also reserved.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as
Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid, One
Year, \$10.00. Six Months, \$6.00. Three
Months, \$3.50. Single Copies, 10 Cents.
Daily and Sunday, \$10.00. Daily only, \$6.00.
Sunday only, \$3.50. Foreign Rates, \$12.00.
Daily and Sunday, \$12.00. Daily only, \$8.00.
Sunday only, \$4.50. THE EVENING SUN, Per Month, \$3.00.
THE EVENING SUN, Per Year, \$36.00.
THE EVENING SUN (Foreign), Per Year, \$42.00.

BOOKS AND THE BOOK WORLD
Published by the Sun Publishing Association,
150 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, N. Y.
President, Frank A. Munsey, 150 Nassau St.,
Vice-President, Irving Wardman, Secretary,
H. H. Thibault, Treasurer, Wm. T. Dewar,
211 E. 10th Street, New York.

All checks, money orders, etc., to be
made payable to The Sun Publishing Association.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the
Sun Publishing Association, 150 Nassau St.,
Borough of Manhattan, N. Y. President,
Frank A. Munsey, 150 Nassau St., Vice-
President, Irving Wardman, Secretary,
H. H. Thibault, Treasurer, Wm. T. Dewar,
211 E. 10th Street, New York.

London office, 40-42 Fleet Street.
Paris office, 4 Rue de la Michodière.
Rue du Quatre Septembre.
Washington office, Munsey Building,
Brooklyn office, 100-102 Eagle Building,
100-102 Washington Street.

If our friends who favor us with manu-
scripts and illustrations for publication wish
to have their articles returned they must
in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

TELEPHONE, BEEKMAN 2200.

From War in Self-Defense to War
for World Idealism.

If Mr. Wilson, as his Boston ad-
dress reveals, has changed his views
of why we went to war against Ger-
many, he cannot change the facts
which drove us into that war. If,
after the war, his own purpose has
become the opposite of what it was
before the war, he cannot assume that
the minds of the American people
have veered with his mind.

At Boston, last Monday, Mr. Wil-
son declared that we drew the sword
for the sake of the rest of humanity:
"We set this up to make men free and
we did not confine our conception and
purpose to America. Now we will
make men free. If we did not do that
the fame of America would be gone
and all her powers would be dis-
sipated."

But in Washington on April 2, 1917,
Mr. Wilson told Congress and the
nation that Germany had forced us
into a state of war; and he urged
Congress to give him the powers and
the means to fight back in self-
defense:

"American ships have been sunk,
American lives taken in ways which
it has stirred us very deeply to learn of,
but the ships and people of other neutral
and friendly nations have been sunk and
overwhelmed in the waters in the same
way. . . . When I addressed the
Congress on the 25th of February last
I thought it would suffice to assert our
neutral rights with arms, our right to
use the seas against unlawful inter-
ference, our right to keep our people safe
against unlawful violence. But armed
neutrality it now appears is imprac-
ticable. . . ."

Again at Boston, last Monday, Mr.
Wilson said, "If, after having gone
into the war to make all men free,
America were at this juncture to fall
the world, what would come of it?"

He added:

"Men will be thrown back upon the
bitterness of disappointment not only,
but the bitterness of despair. . . . All
nations will be set up as hostile camps
again; the men at the Peace Conference
will go home with their heads upon
their breasts—for they were bidden not
to come home from there until they did
something more than sign a treaty of
peace. . . ."

"Think of the picture, think of the
utter blackness that would fall upon the
world. America has failed! America
made a little essay at generosity and
then withdrew. American said, 'We are
your friends,' but it was only for to-day,
not for to-morrow. America said, 'Here
is our power to vindicate right,' and
then the next day said, 'Let right take
care of itself and we will take care of
ourselves.' America said, 'We set up a
light to lead men along the paths of
liberty but we have lowered it; it is
intended only to light our own path.'
We set up a great ideal of liberty and
then we said, 'Liberty is a thing that
you must win for yourself. Do not
call upon us.'"

But in that call to Congress for war
on April 2, 1917, President Wilson
stated the path we had to take and
the thing we were going to do as
follows:

"There is one choice we cannot make,
we are incapable of making; we will
not choose the path of submission and
submit the most sacred rights of our na-
tion and our people to be ignored or
violated. . . ."

"I advise that the Congress declare
the recent course of the Imperial Ger-
man Government to be, in fact, nothing
less than war against the Government
and people of the United States; that it
formally accept the status of belligerent
which has been thrust upon it; and that
it take immediate steps not only to put
this country in a more thorough state
of defense, but also to exert all its power
and employ all its resources to bring
the Government of the German Empire
to terms and end the war."

Again in that war message to Con-
gress on April 2, 1917, President Wil-
son made it clear with the most ex-
plicit language why we were going to
join the hosts of battles and what we
were going to achieve there:

"We enter this war only where we are

clearly forced into it because there are
no other means of defending our rights."

At that time, in Mr. Wilson's own
words to Congress, it was self-defense,
the first law of nature, which sent
us into the war. Nothing in all the
months before the war, nothing in the
briefest period of the war, nothing un-
til the Paris Conference of fighting
only for general humanity, of winning
only to take upon our shoulders and
carry all the burdens of the whole
world for all time.

It is true enough that Mr. Wilson
talked a great deal during the war
about making democracy safe as he
has always talked about it. But it
was not until Mr. Wilson got over to
Paris that the American people ever
heard or dreamed that his idea was
or could be that to make democracy
safe the American people must take
care of everybody's democracy in Eu-
rope, everybody's democracy in Asia,
everybody's democracy in Africa—
everybody's democracy everywhere on
earth; must feed and clothe it, must
rear and educate it, must support it,
must live and die for it.

Ex-President Taft as an Authority
on the Constitution.

In the report of WILLIAM H. TAFT's
missionary journey through Nebraska
in behalf of a league of nations, this
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

"I claim to be fairly familiar with
that Constitution. I have made a study
of it for years, and I am sure that the
quotation from an address or an in-
terview—it is not quite clear which—
by the former President occurs:

came to make out his income tax re-
port he would put in JOHN SMITH,
Jr., as an excuse for a deduction of
\$200 from the taxable total. How
now? Why, young JOHN SMITH's ar-
rival, coming in December, permits his
father to make a deduction of only
one-twelfth of \$200, or \$16.66—the
tax on which at 6 per cent. is \$1.

The change in the ruling has cost Mr.
SMITH \$11, an amount of money which
would buy a perambulator.

Is the new ruling fair? Looking at
it from the point of view of a tax ex-
pert—some unmarried old bird, who
dwells more on mathematics than on
mankind—perhaps it is. The Smith
family has had to support JOHN,
Jr., only ten days of the year; ten
days of milk and laundry bills, in-
stead of 365. But how does the mat-
ter work out in the larger sense that
cannot be comprehended by bachelor
accountants? Badly, we think. The
arrival of the stock is nowadays an
expensive event. The exemption of
the tax on the whole \$200—a saving
to the SMITHS of \$12—would be a
small fraction of the money that it
has cost the SMITHS to add a human
unit to the American whole.

It costs to get married and it costs
to increase the family. These costs
are so great that even under the old
ruling the exemptions provided for
married men and for fathers were
domestic situations, each with an in-
come of \$4,000. The bachelor pays a
tax of \$180; the married but child-
less man pays \$120; the married man
with five children, all demanding food,
clothes and education, pays \$60. Yet
it is this man last described upon
whom the Government now fixes its
eye, apprehensive lest the age of his
youngest child shall permit him to
escape the payment of a few dollars;
although the arrival of that same
child may have cost the father \$500.

It's a new Uncle SAM that rattles
the collection box by the side of the
altar and the cradle.

Public Spirit, Not Party Spite, at
Albany.

Governor SMITH, a Democrat, had
a talk yesterday with Senator WAR-
REN, leader of the majority in the
State Senate, and Speaker SWARTZ
of the Assembly, both Republicans.

By the Constitution, Section
6, paragraph 2, it is explicitly
provided that:

"No Senator or Representative shall,
during the time for which he was elect-
ed, be appointed to any civil office under
the authority of the United States which
shall have been created, or the emolu-
ments of which shall have been increased
during such time."

The term for which Mr. Knox had
been elected expired March 8, 1911, or
two years after the date his service
as Secretary of State was to begin.
Consequently, he was under a constitu-
tional disqualification for the office
to which Mr. Tarr desired to appoint
him, a fact which entirely escaped Mr.
Tarr's recollection at the time, and
which was brought to his attention
subsequent to the announcement of
Mr. Knox's selection.

The matter was adjusted by amend-
ing the law so that Mr. Knox's com-
pensation as Secretary of State dur-
ing the period his constitutional dis-
qualification persisted was fixed at the
sum the Secretary of State had re-
ceived previous to the passage of the
act revising upward the salaries of ex-
ecutive department heads; and Mr.
Knox served as faithfully for the
smaller sum as he would have served
for the larger. The incident created
much comment and some merit
at Mr. Tarr's expense; and it teaches
that even those professedly familiar
with the Constitution may occasion-
ally err in their conception of our
fundamental law.

A Tax Time Clock at the Altar
and the Cradle.

The Internal Revenue Bureau,
which constitutes itself the official in-
terpreter of the income tax law, now
provides a special headache for newly
married men and two headaches for
young fathers. A year ago, when such
persons were making out their income
reports, they had only to stop and
think whether on December 31, 1917,
they were married or not, and whether
they were or were not on that date
the fathers of children under the age
of eighteen years. Now all is compli-
cated, for the Internal Revenue Bu-
reau makes this announcement:

"If you were entitled to any of the
foregoing exemptions (\$1,000 for a single
person, \$2,000 for a married person
or head of a family, and \$300 additional
for each dependent child) during part
of the year, you may claim as many
twelfths of the exemptions as there
were months in such part of the
year: any part of a month may be
counted as a month."

For example, if JOHN SMITH got
married on February 1, 1918, he is
one-twelfth bachelorette for income tax pur-
poses. Instead of deducting \$2,000
from his income, as his rightful ex-
emption as a married man, he is
permitted to deduct only \$1,000 plus
eleven-twelfths of \$1,000, or \$1,916.66.
The month he waited before leading
his bride to the altar costs him the
tax on \$83.33. That at 6 per cent. is
\$5. If RICHARD ROE's fiancée made
him wait until June his tax will cost
him \$20 more than SMITH pays.

HENRY DOR, the laggard, marrying in
December, is permitted to claim ex-
emption on only \$1,083.33.

The other phase of the ruling is
equally interesting if not equally ex-
pensive. Returning to JOHN SMITH,
wed on February 1, 1918. Let us sup-
pose that on December 20 he was ob-
served going about his office, passing
cigars and smiling a smile not en-
tirely attributable to the holiday sea-
son. He and his wife have added to
the real wealth of the world. Under
the old ruling, when JOHN SMITH

came to make out his income tax re-
port he would put in JOHN SMITH,
Jr., as an excuse for a deduction of
\$200 from the taxable total. How
now? Why, young JOHN SMITH's ar-
rival, coming in December, permits his
father to make a deduction of only
one-twelfth of \$200, or \$16.66—the
tax on which at 6 per cent. is \$1.

The change in the ruling has cost Mr.
SMITH \$11, an amount of money which
would buy a perambulator.

Is the new ruling fair? Looking at
it from the point of view of a tax ex-
pert—some unmarried old bird, who
dwells more on mathematics than on
mankind—perhaps it is. The Smith
family has had to support JOHN,
Jr., only ten days of the year; ten
days of milk and laundry bills, in-
stead of 365. But how does the mat-
ter work out in the larger sense that
cannot be comprehended by bachelor
accountants? Badly, we think. The
arrival of the stock is nowadays an
expensive event. The exemption of
the tax on the whole \$200—a saving
to the SMITHS of \$12—would be a
small fraction of the money that it
has cost the SMITHS to add a human
unit to the American whole.

It costs to get married and it costs
to increase the family. These costs
are so great that even under the old
ruling the exemptions provided for
married men and for fathers were
domestic situations, each with an in-
come of \$4,000. The bachelor pays a
tax of \$180; the married but child-
less man pays \$120; the married man
with five children, all demanding food,
clothes and education, pays \$60. Yet
it is this man last described upon
whom the Government now fixes its
eye, apprehensive lest the age of his
youngest child shall permit him to
escape the payment of a few dollars;
although the arrival of that same
child may have cost the father \$500.

It's a new Uncle SAM that rattles
the collection box by the side of the
altar and the cradle.

Public Spirit, Not Party Spite, at
Albany.

Governor SMITH, a Democrat, had
a talk yesterday with Senator WAR-
REN, leader of the majority in the
State Senate, and Speaker SWARTZ
of the Assembly, both Republicans.

By the Constitution, Section
6, paragraph 2, it is explicitly
provided that:

"No Senator or Representative shall,
during the time for which he was elect-
ed, be appointed to any civil office under
the authority of the United States which
shall have been created, or the emolu-
ments of which shall have been increased
during such time."

The term for which Mr. Knox had
been elected expired March 8, 1911, or
two years after the date his service
as Secretary of State was to begin.
Consequently, he was under a constitu-
tional disqualification for the office
to which Mr. Tarr desired to appoint
him, a fact which entirely escaped Mr.
Tarr's recollection at the time, and
which was brought to his attention
subsequent to the announcement of
Mr. Knox's selection.

The matter was adjusted by amend-
ing the law so that Mr. Knox's com-
pensation as Secretary of State dur-
ing the period his constitutional dis-
qualification persisted was fixed at the
sum the Secretary of State had re-
ceived previous to the passage of the
act revising upward the salaries of ex-
ecutive department heads; and Mr.
Knox served as faithfully for the
smaller sum as he would have served
for the larger. The incident created
much comment and some merit
at Mr. Tarr's expense; and it teaches
that even those professedly familiar
with the Constitution may occasion-
ally err in their conception of our
fundamental law.

A Tax Time Clock at the Altar
and the Cradle.

The Internal Revenue Bureau,
which constitutes itself the official in-
terpreter of the income tax law, now
provides a special headache for newly
married men and two headaches for
young fathers. A year ago, when such
persons were making out their income
reports, they had only to stop and
think whether on December 31, 1917,
they were married or not, and whether
they were or were not on that date
the fathers of children under the age
of eighteen years. Now all is compli-
cated, for the Internal Revenue Bu-
reau makes this announcement:

"If you were entitled to any of the
foregoing exemptions (\$1,000 for a single
person, \$2,000 for a married person
or head of a family, and \$300 additional
for each dependent child) during part
of the year, you may claim as many
twelfths of the exemptions as there
were months in such part of the
year: any part of a month may be
counted as a month."

For example, if JOHN SMITH got
married on February 1, 1918, he is
one-twelfth bachelorette for income tax pur-
poses. Instead of deducting \$2,000
from his income, as his rightful ex-
emption as a married man, he is
permitted to deduct only \$1,000 plus
eleven-twelfths of \$1,000, or \$1,916.66.
The month he waited before leading
his bride to the altar costs him the
tax on \$83.33. That at 6 per cent. is
\$5. If RICHARD ROE's fiancée made
him wait until June his tax will cost
him \$20 more than SMITH pays.

HENRY DOR, the laggard, marrying in
December, is permitted to claim ex-
emption on only \$1,083.33.

The other phase of the ruling is
equally interesting if not equally ex-
pensive. Returning to JOHN SMITH,
wed on February 1, 1918. Let us sup-
pose that on December 20 he was ob-
served going about his office, passing
cigars and smiling a smile not en-
tirely attributable to the holiday sea-
son. He and his wife have added to
the real wealth of the world. Under
the old ruling, when JOHN SMITH

came to make out his income tax re-
port he would put in JOHN SMITH,
Jr., as an excuse for a deduction of
\$200 from the taxable total. How
now? Why, young JOHN SMITH's ar-
rival, coming in December, permits his
father to make a deduction of only
one-twelfth of \$200, or \$16.66—the
tax on which at 6 per cent. is \$1.

The change in the ruling has cost Mr.
SMITH \$11, an amount of money which
would buy a perambulator.

Is the new ruling fair? Looking at
it from the point of view of a tax ex-
pert—some unmarried old bird, who
dwells more on mathematics than on
mankind—perhaps it is. The Smith
family has had to support JOHN,
Jr., only ten days of the year; ten
days of milk and laundry bills, in-
stead of 365. But how does the mat-
ter work out in the larger sense that
cannot be comprehended by bachelor
accountants? Badly, we think. The
arrival of the stock is nowadays an
expensive event. The exemption of
the tax on the whole \$200—a saving
to the SMITHS of \$12—would be a
small fraction of the money that it
has cost the SMITHS to add a human
unit to the American